

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 4:16CR00107 JAR
	)	
SACOREY CLARK,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Noelle C. Collins (ECF No. 90). On September 8, 2016, Defendant Clark filed a Pro Se Affidavit (ECF No 51) which the Court construed as a Motion to Suppress Physical Evidence and Statements. Thereafter, Defendant Clark filed two additional Pro Se Motions to Suppress Physical Evidence and Statements on November 18, 2016 (ECF Nos. 65 and 71). Magistrate Judge Collins recommends the Court deny Defendant's Motions to Suppress Physical Evidence and Statements.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), these matters were referred to United States Magistrate Judge Noelle C. Collins, who filed a Report and Recommendation on March 1, 2017 (ECF No. 90). Defendant Clark filed objections to the Report and Recommendation on March 20, 2017 (ECF No. 96)<sup>1</sup>. Defendant Clark summarily states that he objects to several conclusions drawn by Magistrate Judge Collins, but fails to provide any countervailing rationale for his position. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The Report & Recommendation issued by the Magistrate Judge encompasses a large number of motions filed by the Defendant. The Magistrate Judge made both rulings and recommendations in the Report & Recommendation, and the only motions properly before the undersigned are the Motions to Suppress (Doc. Nos. 51, 65 and 71). To the extent Defendant's objections to the Report & Recommendation pertain to other Motions already ruled by the Magistrate Judge, they are overruled.

Court finds that the Magistrate Judge's conclusions are supported by the evidence, and Defendant Clark's objections are not persuasive.

The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Pro Se Motions to Suppress Physical Evidence and Statements (ECF Nos. 51, 65 and 71) be denied. After de novo review of this matter, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's recommendation.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge [ECF No. 90] is **SUSTAINED, ADOPTED, AND INCORPORATED** herein.


**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Pro Se Motions to Suppress Physical Evidence and Statements [ECF Nos. 51, 65 and 71] are **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to terminate standby counsel [ECF No. 38] and Defendant's Pro Se Motion for Leave to supplement previously filed motion to dismiss [ECF No. 64] are considered and **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the remaining pending motions: Pro Se Motion Requesting Forms [ECF No. 82]; Pro Se Motion for Issuance and Service of Subpoenas [ECF No. 84]; and Pro Se Motion for Issuance and Service of Subpoenas to Include an Order for a Hearing [ECF No. 88] are all **DENIED as moot** as they appear to relate to the pretrial hearing.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Court shall hold a Status Conference in this case on **Wednesday, April 12, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.**

Dated this 4<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN A. ROSS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE